DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 582 EA 031 052

AUTHOR Lee, Valerie E.; Croninger, Robert G.
TITLE Elements of Social Capital in the Context of Six High Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1999-08-20
NOTE 34p.; This study was supported by a grant from the Field-Initiated Studies Program, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Contributors included Elisabeth DeGroot, Helen M. Marks, Patricia McMahon, and Douglas Ready. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference, "Social Capital: An International Conference Bridging Disciplines, Policies, and Communities" (Michigan State University, April 1998).
CONTRACT R306F60096
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; High Risk Students; High Schools; *Peer Relationship; Power Structure; *Social Capital; *Social Cognition; *Social Differences; *Social Exchange Theory; Social Networks; Social Psychology; Social Status; Social Structure
IDENTIFIERS *Bourdieu (Pierre); Office of Educational Research and Improvement; University of Michigan

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to expand the conceptualization of social capital to guide investigations of the construct in educational settings. Based on fieldwork in six U.S. high schools, the authors present a framework for studying the effects of school-based forms of social capital on adolescents' academic development. The study identified six elements of social capital in this framework. Three address inherent qualities of social capital (its use, location, and intentionality), while three focus on organizational mechanisms that influence students' access to social capital (volition, impetus, and norms). Matching school contexts with these elements, the researchers found that social capital is easier to generate and sustain in schools of choice. Also, schools where social capital occurs naturally are not necessarily places where relationships between students and teachers are productive. Even in schools with well-intentioned teachers, positive relationships, and innovative programs, disadvantaged social conditions limit students' academic development. The authors use their framework to discuss positive and negative aspects of social capital in these settings. The paper concludes with a discussion of the theoretical utility of social capital for educational research and policy. (Contains 44 references.)(Author/TEJ)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 454 582

Elements of Social Capital in the Context of Six High Schools

Valerie E. Lee
University of Michigan

Robert G. Croninger
University of Maryland

August 20, 1999

This study was supported by a grant from the Field-Initiated Studies Program, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education (Grant Number R306F60096), for which the two authors served as principal investigators. The findings and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference, "Social Capital: An International Conference Bridging Disciplines, Policies, and Communities," Michigan State University, April 1998. We wish to acknowledge field-research team members who contributed substantially to this study. Elisabeth DeGroot, Helen M. Marks, Patricia McMahon, and Douglas Ready served as lead researchers; Todd Chow-Hoy, Tehani Collazo, Shannon Curtis, Karen Ross, and Steven Sheldon served as research assistants.

EA 031 052

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Elements of Social Capital in the Context of Six High Schools

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to expand the conceptualization of social capital to guide investigations of the construct in educational settings. Based on fieldwork in six U.S. high schools, we present a framework for studying the effects of school-based forms of social capital on adolescents' academic development. We identify six elements of social capital in our framework. Three address inherent qualities of social capital (its use, location, and intentionality) while three focus on organizational mechanisms that influence students' access to social capital (volition, impetus, and norms). Matching school contexts with elements, we find that social capital is easier to generate and sustain in schools of choice. We also conclude that schools where social capital occurs naturally are not necessarily places where relationships between students and teachers are productive. Even in schools with well-intentioned teachers, positive relationships, and innovative programs, disadvantaged social conditions limit students' academic development. We use our framework to discuss positive and negative aspects of social capital in these settings. We conclude with a discussion of the theoretical utility of social capital for educational research and policy.

Elements of Social Capital in the Context of Six High Schools

Introduction

Social capital is a relatively new construct in the lexicon of sociologists. Although the idea that social relationships are an important source of power and influence can be traced to classical theorists (e.g., Durkheim 1973; Simmel 1978; Weber 1968), the construct of social capital portrays this basic sociological observation as a resource that individuals exchange, accumulate, and deplete (e.g., Coleman 1988; Bourdieu 1986; Putnam 1995; 1996). This perspective on social relationships has much intuitive appeal (Schneider 1996). First, the construct of social capital identifies a long-recognized feature of communal and organizational life: that social relations form a basis for both individual and cooperative action (Coleman 1988; 1990). Second, by identifying social relations as a form of capital, positive attributes of social life can be controlled or managed, similar to other forms of capital (Coleman 1993).

James Coleman was instrumental in introducing the social capital concept to education researchers, although he attributes the term to Loury (1977) and notes similar theoretical discussions of this social phenomenon by others (e.g., Bourdieu 1986; Granovetter 1973). According to Coleman, social capital takes on special importance in education, where the socialization of the young shifts from the family to public institutions. Differences between schools in their effectiveness may be explained by how well family bonds are extended into schools and supportive social relationships form between school members (Coleman 1988; 1990). In this context, variation in student outcomes and school functioning may be explained by differences in social capital that schools members can access to accomplish developmental and educational goals.

Although some studies have shown that schools differ in the extent to which students have access to supportive relationships with their teachers (e.g., Bryk, Lee, and Holland 1993), few writings have conceptualized how social capital operates and takes shape in schools. School choice has been examined as a form of social capital, in that it encourages the formation of communities with similar values and ambitions for children (Coleman and Hoffer 1987; Gamoran 1996). Other research has used a social capital framework to explore the role of access to support and guidance from teachers, counselors, and peers in students' academic development (Stanton-Salazar 1997; Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch 1995). Though these examinations have generated intri-

guing speculations about the theoretical significance of social capital, there is little agreement about what social capital is in the context of schools, where it is likely to be found, and how it actually influences behavior.

Qualities of social structures to which young people and their families belong have also been identified as forms of social capital. Closed social structures encouraging interactions between parents are thought to promote the joint monitoring of children's behavior (Coleman 1988; 1990). Further, such neighborhood characteristics as residential stability (Coleman 1988; 1990) and perceived safety (Furstenberg and Hughes 1995) have been posited as forms of social capital associated with student outcomes. Neighborhoods where people are safe to interact are certainly desirable places to raise children, but how such aspects of children's social structures influence their academic development is unclear. Without more theoretical and explanatory depth, such studies show only that neighborhood qualities are associated with student outcomes.

Our point here is simple. We need more conceptual clarity about what social capital is and how it operates in schools. Otherwise, how useful is this concept is for explaining children's educational success or failure? First, we know little about the forms that social capital might take, and how such forms are related to students' academic development. Most studies assume that social capital is uniform in both substance and effect. Social relations that lead to positive outcomes are thought to be examples of social capital; social relations leading to negative outcomes are seen as examples of its absence. Though such ambiguity in meaning has contributed to the construct's popular usage, without clearer theoretical boundaries the notion of social capital is little more than an "umbrella" phrase for familiar constructs (Epstein 1996) and desirable educational outcomes (Portes 1998).

Second, current investigations of social capital focus primarily on how adults can cooperate in child rearing activities or in controlling young people's behavior (e.g., Coleman 1988; Furstenberg and Hughes 1995). Far less often has the emphasis been on adolescents themselves -- the manner in which young people might come to value relationships with adults and work cooperatively with them toward accomplishing academic ends. If social capital is to be a useful construct in explaining student outcomes, there must be a clearer focus on how young people themselves actually acquire and use social capital to accomplish academic tasks. To explain educational outcomes, current studies fail to describe how social capital is generated and directed by both adults and young people toward academic ends.

Finally, a number of mechanisms have been posited for generating social capital (e.g. stable, homogeneous communities, school choice), but current investigations rarely distinguish between *mechanisms* that shape students' access to social capital and the *qualities* that define the construct itself. Social structures are often presented as examples of social capital because such structures are thought to promote desirable forms of social relations and exchanges between adults and students (e.g., Coleman 1988; Lichter, Cornwell, and Eggebean 1993; Smith, Beaulieu, and Israel 1992). If the notion of social capital is to be relevant for social policy, we need to distinguish between the mechanisms that produce (and destroy) it and the qualities that define it. We suggest that researchers should first link specific mechanisms to forms of social capital, and then link specific forms to educational outcomes.

We hope this paper contributes to the development of the concept of social capital and provides some detail about how it works in educational settings. Based on fieldwork in six U.S. high schools, we present a framework for studying the effects of school-based social capital on adolescents' academic development. We identify six elements of social capital. Three elements address its inherent qualities; three focus on social and organizational mechanisms that influence students' access to it. In presenting this framework, our goal is not to propose a complete theoretical explanation for how social capital works in schools. Rather, we take our lead from Karl Popper (1968), who argued that the logic of scientific discovery requires that we make the mesh ever finer and finer in the theories that we cast to catch what we call "the world." By tightening the conceptual net referred to as social capital, we seek to enhance it's usefulness for understanding educational phenomena.

Theoretical Boundaries

Underlying the idea of social capital are two distinct, though related, propositions about human behavior. First, some individuals are successful because they rely on relatives, friends, and acquaintances for assistance. This proposition casts social capital as a resource embedded in a person's social network (e.g., Boisjoly, Duncan, and Hofferth 1995; Cochran, Larner, Riley, Gunnarrson, and Henderson 1990; Furstenberg and Hughes 1995; Lee and Smith (in press); Portes 1998; Stanton-Salazar 1997). Examples of such resources include emotional support, information, guidance, physical help, and financial assistance. When students use such resources to accomplish valuable

school tasks, social capital can be thought to explain their educational outcomes. Hence, the construct of social capital is embedded in both the possibility and manner in which students translate their relationships with others (peers, teachers, and other adults) into important educational advantages.

The second proposition casts social capital as a collective resource -- in this instance, an aspect of broader social structures and shared life that promote effective collective actions (e.g., Coleman 1988; 1990; Loury 1977; Putnam 1996). Characteristics of these structures include (but again are not limited to) the extent to which group life promotes cooperation, builds trust, efficiently delegates authority, and maintains effective norms or sanctions (Coleman 1990). Such attributes influence the quality of relationships formed in social groups, especially the ease with which people engage in mutually satisfying exchanges or come to empathize with the interests of others. A second component, therefore, in a theory of social capital's effects on educational achievement involves the manner in which the structural characteristics of social groups facilitate (or hinder) helpful exchanges between members.

In sum, social capital represents the potential for more effective action embedded in social relations. It is both an individual asset (Boisjoly et al. 1995) and a communal good (Coleman 1990; Putnam 1995; 1996). As these propositions suggest, social capital makes a link between micro- and macro-theories of human behavior (Alexander 1988). At the micro (or individual) level, social capital functions as a resource that individuals may draw upon to pursue their interests. In this sense, it fits with micro-economic models that characterize individuals as rational decision makers or utility maximizers (Coleman, 1990). At the macro (or structural) level, social capital includes norms, traditions, patterns of behaviors, and social organizational characteristics that shape both the goals that people pursue (i.e., the utility that persons wish to maximize) and their opportunities to do so (i.e., the willingness to engage in exchanges). To understand social capital, we must consider theoretical and analytic issues at both levels.

These propositions serve as theoretical boundaries for our investigation, rather than definitive theories or conceptualizations of what social capital is and how it operates in schools. Like other writers (e.g., Epstein 1996; Portes 1998), we lament the vague and arbitrary nature of definitions of social capital in the sociological and educational literature. Rather than presenting yet another definition, we identify what we consider to be some fundamental propositions about social capital that help us understand human

behavior. Within these theoretical boundaries, we seek to refine the construct of social capital as it helps us understand educational phenomena.

Elements of Social Capital

Our dissatisfaction with current discussions of social capital led us to re-examine the literature in light of our field experiences. We believe that this construct requires substantial conceptual development if social capital is to serve as an explanation for why academic outcomes differ between students and across schools. We need to distinguish between the qualities of social capital (as an individual resource) and the mechanisms through which it influences various outcomes (those aspects of organization and structure that promote social exchanges). We argue for the utility of making such distinctions contextually specific; that is, that features of social capital should be linked directly to the outcomes that they are meant to influence.

The outcomes we consider involve high-school students' academic development, especially students who might be characterized as at risk of educational failure. We have divided the social capital construct into six elements, three of which address its qualities. Three other elements characterize broad mechanisms that influence access to social capital and how it affects academic development. In the framework we have developed, qualities of social capital include its use, location, and intentionality. Mechanisms include volition, impetus, and norms. We recognize certain limitations in our own framework, including some "fuzziness" and potential overlap in categories. Nonetheless, we have found this framework, even in its nascent form, to be useful in our understanding how social capital plays out in high schools. We describe the elements of our framework briefly below and summarize them in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Qualities of Social Capital

Uses. Because social capital may serve many purposes, its fungibility (like other forms of capital) makes it a valuable possession (Bourdieu 1986). An important quality of social capital is the use individuals make of it in their social interactions. In regard to adolescents' schooling, we consider whether students' social relationships facilitate or hinder the acquisition of desirable academic outcomes. Teachers may use social relations with their stu-

dents to build their commitment to academic pursuits. Students may help one another in situations where adult assistance is either unavailable or seen as undesirable. On the other hand, they may rely on each other to resist the imposition of academic expectations they may consider unimportant, illegitimate, or personally harmful. Our point here is that what individuals choose to do with social capital varies across actors, circumstances, and settings.

Location. Multiple locations can be considered in examining the impact of social capital on any outcome. In schools, locations include (but are not restricted to) students' interactions with teachers and peers, and teachers' interactions with other teachers and parents. For example, through their roles as instructors, advisors, and mentors, teachers are gatekeepers to valuable institutional resources and educational opportunities for students (Lee, Bryk, and Smith 1993; Stanton-Salazar 1997). Students' relations with peers may either promote or discourage academic achievement (Coleman 1988, 1990), just as collegial relations among teachers may influence student out- comes by enhancing instruction and other forms of teacher behaviors (Lee et al. 1993). Although teacher-parent relationships have potential for improving students' school performance (Epstein 1996), the actual scope of these interactions is typically limited in high schools, either rather formal (parent nights or report card distribution) or unpleasant (delivering bad news).

Intentionality. In small and rural settings, where people know one another well and interact often, social capital is natural and plentiful (Coleman 1988; 1990). By the nature of some schools' locations and clienteles, informal relations accrue among parents, teachers, and students. Outside of rural settings, stocks of natural social capital may be lower. Recent school reforms have identified the importance of intentionally creating positive social capital in schools (Annenberg 1994; NASSP 1996; Sizer 1984). Smaller instructional units, limits on the numbers of students that teachers instruct, block scheduling, after-school tutoring, advisory homerooms, and mentoring programs have all been suggested as ways to promote stable and positive relations between school members. A quality of social capital is, thus, intentionality: the extent to which school members consciously foster and nurture it in their interactions, particularly in places where it doesn't occur naturally.

Mechanisms for Generating and Sustaining Social Capital

Volition. Importants dimension of schools are the opportunities they provide for students, parents, and teachers to choose with whom they affiliate

and for what purposes. Choice of schools is a type of external volition, as students and teachers may themselves determine whether to seek membership in a school. Internal volition may also be available to students and teachers, even in schools where membership is assigned or determined by others. Through special programs and activities, students and teachers may choose to affiliate with subgroups or smaller units composed of people who share their academic interests or social values. The problems of establishing trust with strangers, or of identifying mutual goals, is simplified by choice. We agree with Bryk and colleagues, who state that although such "voluntary association does not automatically create social capital... it is harder to develop such capital in its absence" (1993:314).

Impetus. Where does the impetus for creating and sustaining social capital in schools come from? In most instances, the major impetus lies in the self-interest of individual students, parents, or teachers. School members seek out relations with other members thought to possess valuable resources or to procure some advantage. Other reasons beyond rational self-interest may spur the creation of social capital. Students and teachers may act beyond their immediate best interests, because doing so promotes both a personal and shared value. Such factors include traditions, shared ideologies (religious or secular), the moral authority of charismatic leaders, and commitment to the common good. In schools supporting particular ideologies or moral perspectives, ritual activities often renew individual commitment (Bryk et al. 1993).

Norms and sanctions. Sanctions generate and maintain social capital in schools. Such sanctions as poor grades, detention, suspension, or alternative programs establish clear boundaries for behavior (Coleman 1990). Sanctions can, however, undermine the trust that students place in their teachers, thus weakening students' access to social capital (Natriello, Riehl, and Pallas 1994). If such sanctions are imposed often, students may come to believe that success is unattainable and that teachers do not care about them. On the other hand, if sanctions are imposed inconsistently or rarely, students may conclude that behavioral standards are meaningless, easily violated, and without consequence. The balance that schools strike between high expectations for behavior, personal responsibility, care, and punishment influences the nature of social capital available to students. Macro-level norms of civility, trust, and caring, which represent important characteristics of school social organization,[1] may be powerful ways of setting standards for individuals' behaviors toward their fellow school members.

Method

Overall Approach

A case study design, which can be used to help the researcher identify a conceptual framework or provide insight in illuminating related constructs, seemed to suit our purpose well (Stake 1994). We wanted to understand the nature of social capital, its creation, and its use in a small number of high schools. We were especially interested in how social capital influences the academic development of high school students, particularly those at risk of educational failure (i.e., low-income students, minority students, inner-city school students, and students who experience academic or behavioral problems). Our purpose was to compare and contrast differences and similarities among case sites (1) where we thought social capital might be plentiful (including schools of choice), (2) that enrolled substantial numbers of at-risk students, but (3) varied along key organizational and structural features. Two of Erickson's general guidelines for qualitative research fit this study well: "specific understanding through documentation of concrete details of practice" (Erickson 1986:121) and "comparative understanding beyond the immediate circumstance of the local setting" (1986:122).

Field Sites

We solicited nominations of high schools from researchers, national reform advocates, and state educators. We also investigated schools described in newspapers or journals that had attributes of interest to us. We speculated that opportunities for voluntary associations would be a mechanism in the develop- ment and maintenance of social capital, so we looked for high schools that varied on this dimension. Thus, our sample is not random but purposeful (Patton 1990). We also attempted to include schools that vary on school size, urbanicity, reform practices, choice status, and student population. After narrowing the list to a promising set of candidates, we visited schools to determine their suitability as field sites and, if suitable, to solicit participation. Table 1 presents descriptive information about the six high schools we studied. Although school names are fictitious, other information is accurate. Information is for the 1996-97 school year.

Insert Table 2 about here

Zachary Taylor. Zachary Taylor is a "zoned" public high school located in a large Eastern city. About one-third of Taylor's students are white, making it the most diverse comprehensive secondary school in a city whose school population is overwhelmingly black. Over half the students qualify for free or reduced lunches. High dropout rates, absenteeism, student mobility, course failure rates, and low achievement are challenges faced by Taylor staff. In 1994, state officials designated the school as eligible for state take over and reconstitution.[2] Since then Taylor has undertaken extensive reforms, the major components of which include substantial re-staffing and breaking the school into five academies. The fact that initial evaluations of these reforms suggested substantial improvements in student-teacher relationships and collegiality led us to include Zachary Taylor in our study.

Calvin Coolidge. Calvin Coolidge is a small all-white high school located in rural area in the northern Midwest. Coolidge is a prominent landmark in this agrarian community; signs leading into town proudly portray the school's mascot and slogan. The building, which still includes part of the school's original stone structure, houses grades K-12. Nearly half of the students qualify for subsidized lunches. Although practically everyone graduates from Coolidge, very few attend selective colleges, choosing instead to work in the area or attend less prestigious post-secondary schools nearby. The curriculum is traditional; many Coolidge teachers have been at the school for decades. The school and surrounding communities can be characterized as stable, relatively closed, and traditionally minded, three structural attributes Coleman (1990) associates with social capital. Parents are active in the school.[3]

Woodrow Wilson. Located in a large city in the Midwest, Woodrow Wilson draws an economically diverse student population from nearby ethnic neighborhoods. Most of the 1,100 students are minority and many come from non-English speaking homes. Like other inner-city high schools, Wilson faces declining test scores, spotty student attendance, and high student mobility. Still, when compared to other high schools in this problem-plagued district, Woodrow Wilson stands out as one of the better high schools in the city. Major curriculum and structural reforms have dominated the school's agenda for over a decade, including charter membership in the Coalition of Essential Schools and a well-developed Paideia curriculum. A major focus of these reforms has been to promote strong student-teacher relationships, collegiality among faculty, and an uncompromising focus on academic achievement, qualities that led us to select Wilson.

Andrew Jackson. Andrew Jackson is a small alternative high school in a prosperous, medium-sized city. It stands in stark contrast to the two large, zoned comprehensive high schools in this Midwestern school district. Jackson, which has an open attendance policy, has become a popular school of choice. Increasing numbers of families have sought to place their children at this school known for its democratic philosophy and academic programs. Most of Jackson's 400 students are white and upper-middle or middle class, although many had low commitment to school before coming to Jackson. The innovative curriculum provides students with many opportunities to design their own courses of study. Although students take most of their courses at Andrew Jackson, they may also enroll in courses at a nearby community college and a university, or, devise a course focused largely on activities within the community. The latter program, together with a very strong homeroom program, led us to include Jackson in our study sample.

St. Francis Assisi. St. Francis of Assisi is a small, non-selective, inner-city Catholic high school. Located in a large, racially segregated, Midwestern city, St. Francis enrolls an entirely African-American student population of 365. Although very few students are Catholic, most come from working- and middle-class families with strong religious beliefs. Catholic religious symbols and artifacts celebrating African-American heritage exist side-by-side in classrooms and hallways, recognizing the diverse traditions and values drawn upon in the school's programs and activities. Roughly half of St. Francis students come from surrounding neighborhoods; the remainder come from greater distances, including nearby suburbs. Major attractions include the school's emphasis on moral development, a good record of college placement, and strong sports programs. St. Francis provides students with a basic college preparatory curriculum and few curricular choices. That very few students are Catholic and many come into the city from the suburbs were reasons why we included St. Francis in our study sample.

Cardinal McGuire. Cardinal McGuire is medium-sized Catholic high school located in a working-class suburb of an Eastern city with very troubled public schools. Founded in 1964 by a religious order (which still sponsors the school),[4] McGuire began as an all-male school. Declining enrollments, financial problems, and a weakening local job market forced the school to merge with an all-female Catholic high school in 1991. Since these troubled times, McGuire's applications have increased, allowing more selectivity in admissions and faculty hiring. Nonetheless, despite its growing popularity with families,

McGuire's tuition is less than most private high schools in the area, reflecting a commitment to serving an economically diverse student population. The majority of McGuire's 685 students are black; roughly half are Catholic. The curriculum is traditional, and extra-curricular activities focus on competitive sports and community service. Nearly all students graduate and many receive scholarships to nationally recognized colleges or universities. Its strong social justice mission led us to include it in our study sample.

Data Collection and Analysis

We conducted a comparative case study of the six high schools (Yinn 1994). Each high school had a team of 2-3 researchers assigned to it: a lead researcher and one or more graduate research assistants. Teams visited high schools at least twice, once in Fall 1997 and once in Spring 1998. During each week-long visit, we conducted individual interviews with principals, key administrative staff, guidance counselors, and teachers; we also conducted focus groups with teachers, parents, and students (minimally, one focus group representative of the school population, another representative of students the school identified as at risk of possible school failure). Interviews, which ranged from 45 minutes to 2 hours, were taped and transcribed verbatim. No fewer than 35 formal interviews were conducted at each school.

Team members compiled documents, transcribed interviews, validated transcripts, completed field notes, and cross-checked notes with other team members. After the Fall visit, each team then wrote a detailed case study about "its" school. The case studies followed a common outline, but also included idiosyncratic information about each school. Drafts were shared among teams, discussed and debated, and used to develop protocols for the Spring visit. We followed this same process after completing the second round of data collection, revising and expanding the case studies. Final case studies, 65-100 pages in length, represent the cumulative observations of team members.

These case studies form the basis for this paper. From them, we drew up a series of tables for each school, organized by the six elements in our framework. From those tables, we created a single table with 36 cells (6 schools by 6 elements). In constructing these tables, we followed guidelines from Miles and Huberman (1994) for analyzing qualitative data. Although our observations and analysis were bounded by the theoretical assumptions that we made in designing the case studies, we did not have a clear set of propositions to test about either the qualities of social capital or the mechanisms that

influence it. Rather, we used our field data to refine our preliminary framework and enrich our understanding of the construct of social capital and how it influences students' academic development in these settings. This analytic approach emphasizes the potential for exploratory analysis through comparative case studies (Stake 1994), as well as the merit of using both inductive and deductive methods in analyzing qualitative data (Miles and Huberman 1994).

Results

How do the elements of social capital that we spelled out above play out in the school settings we studied? In reviewing this section, in which we spell out our observations and analyses, readers may find it useful to refer to the tables. Table 1 summarizes our framework for the elements of social capital; Table 2 provides summary information about the settings. Results are organized around the elements, separated into (1) the qualities of social capital and (2) the mechanisms for generating and sustaining it.

Qualities of Social Capital

Uses of social capital. Although we intended to study school-based social capital directed to students' academic development, not all social capital was of this type. We found considerable variation within and between schools in the purposes to which members directed social capital. Although most teachers felt knowing their students better fosters commitment toward academic pursuits, this attitude was not universal nor without reservations. Teachers identified a tension between uses that are almost entirely academic, and uses that are focused primarily on the personal needs and issues that students bring to the classroom. This tension between fulfilling the academic and personal needs of students appeared to be managed more successfully in some schools than others. Lee, Ready, and Ross (1999), who used the same data for their study, discuss this tensionin more detail.

The primary focus of adult-student relationships was around academic concerns in both of the Catholic schools that we studied, as well as at Wilson, where reforms were infused with a strong instructional philosophy and academic focus. Teachers in each of these high schools felt that it is important to know their students, but they also cautioned against becoming overly involved in students' personal lives. A veteran teacher at St. Francis distinguished between "pushers" and "acceptors," whereas a Jackson teacher characterized a

similar tension between "teacher as professional" and "teacher as friend and counselor." A repeated concern of teachers who tried to maintain an academic focus was that highly personalized relationships with students might detract from student learning.

These teachers thought that personal relationships with students create bonds of obligation that often make it more difficult to maintain high standards for students' behavior and academic performance. A teacher at Cardinal McGuire worried that knowledge about students' personal lives might cause her to lower her expectations for specific students.

I don't try to know too much about where, what their personal life is... I try not to because I want them to be on the same playing ground, playing field as the rest of the group. If I know too much then I would cater to them way too much. (Female teacher, McGuire)

A teacher at the other Catholic school was concerned that students become too dependent on teachers when they provide much assistance and attention.

I guess sometimes, because this school has a lot of needy students, and low-skill students that I think sometimes as teachers we help them too much and kind of hand feed them too much and baby them too much... When it comes time for a test, they are so used to us helping them and walking them through something that they haven't learned how to do that themselves. (Teacher, St. Francis)

Some teachers argued that they have to establish a special bond or level of trust with students before they can learn. Teachers who espoused this philosophy felt that students' personal needs have to come first if they are to sustain their motivation to perform academic tasks that might result in failure. Some teachers with this attitude referred to students as "their babies," "adopted children," or "special projects." A teacher described this stance:

My first step first is [to] show that bond, that close bond first. And then you have to gradually mature [the relationship]... My thing is to tell them, you know, show them love first, and to let them know they are special, and [they] can achieve. (Male teacher, St. Francis)

In our inner-city public high schools, where many students have both academic and social problems, teachers told us that maintaining an academic focus for relationships can be especially difficult. Some wondered how it is possible develop strong personal ties to students while simultaneously maintaining high academic standards. Teachers in a Taylor focus group observed that students "find adults that they can take advantage of" in such relationships or use bonds of friendship to "derail a planned lesson." Moreover, these

ial] he wouldn't pass us," they were critical of almost "everyone else, they don't care... they'll just pass us." Rather than going to teachers for help (academic or social), a female Coolidge student summed up an attitude the group agreed with: "You don't go to your teachers for personal problems or homework or anything. You go to your friends." A colleague added, "...or you just deal with it yourself." We found Coolidge High School quite different from the other schools we studied, which we expand on in the next section.

Intentionality of social capital. In some settings, social capital develops naturally, mostly as a function of the social conditions surrounding a school, whereas in other settings, natural social capital is rare. In the latter settings, individuals must work hard to generate and sustain the forms of social capital that they deem most desirable. What do schools with natural social capital do with it? Is naturally occurring social capital always used productively? In schools where generating and sustaining social capital is a priority, how do school members use it to promote academic development?

Coolidge High School, in the village of Coolidge, represents a prime example of *naturally occurring social capital*. The school serves an all-white and mostly Catholic clientele who reside in a rural and isolated farm area. Few families leave and even fewer move in. Students attend school in the same building, with the same classmates and many of the same teachers, for 13 years. Lockers are unlocked, and almost nothing is ever stolen. Coolidge is what Coleman and Hoffer (1987) call a naturally occurring "functional community." The school is an extension of the town and its surrounding rural area. Homogeneity of beliefs and values makes it easy to mobilize local resources to socialize children and promote school goals. According to the superintendent, no bond issue has failed in Coolidge in close to 30 years.

Although advantages may flow to children and schools from functional communities of this type, the closeness of ties may also create redundancies in information available to members (Morgan and Sorenson 1997) and restrict students' access to educationally valuable forms of social capital (Granovetter 1973). Referring to a student focus group we had conducted, a teacher told us:

> [T]hose seniors you interviewed yesterday, this is the third year in a row that they've had me. Probably one year too many... they've heard my schtick about reading and reading..." (Experienced male teacher, Coolidge)

Moreover, Coolidge students told us that they hesitate to share personal problems with teachers; such confidences might soon become public knowledge.

"Once you get a reputation," a student told us, "you're stuck with it!" At Coolidge High, we sensed an impenetrable line between academic and personal help that neither teachers nor students wish to cross. Both may want "private space" in a setting where almost all space is uncomfortably "public."

Wilson and Taylor represent stark contrasts to Coolidge. A need to generate an obvious lack of productive social capital for the students they serve is quite evident in these inner-city high schools. Taylor and Wilson draw students from low-income urban neighborhoods, where residential mobility is high, poverty is widespread, and values are heterogeneous. This contrasts with Coolidge, where everyone knows everyone and interlocking social networks are common. Within the urban public schools, high rates of student and teacher turnover, high enrollments, and low commitment to school promote anonymity and weak ties between students and teachers. As a result, staff in these schools must build social capital *intentionally* through personal effort, specific reform structures, social and academic programs, and professional ideologies.

To be sure, many of the reform efforts at Taylor and/or Wilson are promising (e.g., academic coaching, core curricula, integrated coursework, block scheduling,[5] schools-within-schools, homeroom/advisory periods, school-wide seminars, common planning periods). Many are promoted by reform advocates as ways to personalize students' educational experiences and promote stronger ties between adolescents and adults (see, e.g., Adler 1982; Annenberg 1994; McDonald 1996; NASSP 1996; Sizer 1984). However, we also observed limitations, as these two inner-city public high schools still have high absenteeism and dropout rates, high course-failure rates, and low achievement despite serious efforts to generate social capital. A teacher expressed his frustration:

> I tell the kids you need to come to school because you **have** to get an education... So then, what am I arguing for? Get your butt in here so you can watch a movie for three class periods because we don't have any substitutes? Get your butt in here so I can ask you to sit quietly while I go have three parent-teacher conferences because I am a pseudo-administrator with a full teaching load? Get your butt in here so that we can have no textbooks? (Young male teacher, Taylor High School)

We conclude that despite these schools' best efforts, and the relative success of these purposeful efforts to create social capital, scarcities in other resources (financial and human) limit even the most dedicated teachers' capacities to address students' personal and educational needs.

Mechanism for Generating and Sustaining Social Capital

Volition and choice. We used voluntary membership, a characteristic of

schools associated with social capital (Bryk et al. 1993; Coleman and Hoffer 1987), as a criterion for selecting schools to study. Half of our sample are schools of choice: two Catholic and one public school. In schools chosen by parents and students, neither commitment nor conflicting values systems are in question. Commitment to the the values on which such schools operate are spelled out clearly as a condition of membership. Choice of schools (by students, families, and teachers) is the external dimension of this element. But even within schools where membership is involuntary there may be sub-units or programs to which members may choose to affiliate. Hence, volition can be thought of as having two dimensions: one external, one internal.

Although schools of choice (by definition) have control over membership, the actual conditions of entry and exit vary among the choice schools we studied. Every spring, Jackson conducts a lottery; about 100 9th graders are selected randomly from an applicant list at least twice that large. Jackson is a small, alternative school, known for it's tolerance of student differences. A Jackson student described her decision to apply:

> Well, if I go to Jackson, I'll just be one more oddball. But then if I am at Waggoneer [one of two large comprehensive high schools in the community] that differentness is going to set me apart. At Jackson I will blend in with my differentness. (Female student, Jackson focus group)

Gaining admission to Jackson is very important to applicants. It is not unusual, according to the principal, for parents to call her and say, "It's life or death for me! My kid will not survive somewhere else." Faculty must also apply to Jackson for membership, drawn by the school's democratic philosophy and tolerance of individual difference.

St. Francis and Cardinal McGuire are similar in many respects. Both are co-educational urban Catholic schools enrolling high proportions of minority students, many of whom are not Catholic. In both schools, parental support and commitment are strong, with large turnouts at parent events (striking compared to the low parent turnout at Wilson and Taylor). The major selection criterion at both schools is self-selection -- an essential feature of all schools of choice. Whereas St. Francis admits almost all applicants who meet minimum academic and behavioral standards (filling enrollments is a constant worry at this school), Cardinal McGuire's enrollment is somewhat more selective. In both schools, however, families apply because of the schools' reputations for solid academics, Christian values, and athletic prowess.

Residential zones determine membership in three of the high schools in

our study. Nonetheless, Taylor and Wilson students have some choice about the programs in which they participate. Because these programs determine a major portion of a student's day-to-day affiliations with peers and teachers, they represent important choices. Taylor has recently been organized into small schools-within-schools comprised of about 250-350 students. At the end of 9th grade students choose one of five academies based on career interests (and often an academy's reputation for academic demands and discipline), where typically they remain until they leave the school. Wilson's students may enroll in the school's Paideia program, a college-preparatory program in a school where about half the students drop out. Although admission to the Paideia program is, in theory, by choice rather than by selection, there is considerable self-selection. Only students interested in a demanding academic curriculum, motivated to work hard in school, and willing to commit to high academic standards select this program.

Our evidence that choice generates social capital is largely indirect. Because we found significant opportunities for choice (external, internal, or both) in most of the schools that we studied, it is difficult to say what social capital would look like in the absence of choice. Nonetheless, we are impressed by the role that volition appears to make in the commitment and value that students, teachers, and parents place in their affiliations. Students select teachers with whom they "click" to develop special relations, families and teachers select schools (sometimes at considerable financial sacrifice) that profess similar social and academic values, and students select education programs that offer experiences they value. A St. Francis student identified one effect of choice on generating social capital when he described the major quality that distinguished his school from other schools in the area: "Unity. We got a lot more unity than everyone else."

Impetus for social capital. Most social capital in schools involves dyadic relationships between individuals. Much of the impetus to form such relationships comes from individual teachers who, for personal or professional reasons, decide that providing social support for students (particularly the ones with whom they have personal contact) is important. Students, of course, may also seek out exchanges with teachers because they see specific teachers as providing valuable resources and educational opportunities. Thus, most of the social capital we observed was micro-level.

Some schools, however, provide an organizational push toward supportive relationships and productive actions. Such a push is consistent with the idea

of schools as communities (see Bryk et al. 1993; Lee et al. 1993). This section focuses on the character of these macro-level organizational thrusts in the schools that we studied. We focus on three possible vehicles for social capital: shared ideologies, moral commitments, and charismatic leadership.

Schools of choice typically organize themselves around particular ideas and values; students and families select schools based on their willingness to commit to those values. Schools organized around religious principles have clearly defined ideologies supportive of productive behaviors and caring. Such values are evidenced in how faculty describe their institutional traditions: The school's president told us: "The history is that Cardinal McGuire is a very forgiving, accepting environment... Students feel accepted, *a part of the fabric of the community.*" [emphasis added] Other ideologies, secular instead of sacred, are at work at Jackson, where students and faculty embrace a tolerance for differences and democratic values. Jackson faculty place much trust in students' ability to make responsible decisions:

> You have to trust kids, and I think that's the difference between our school and some other schools... once you start trusting kids the job becomes easier, the kids enjoy it more and it works. (Male teacher, Jackson)

In addition to normative ideologies that focus on cooperation and the importance of learning, many teachers in our inner-city schools described their personal commitment to social justice. This commitment appeared to be intertwined, in subtle ways, with the ideologies that prevail in their schools. "These children must have someone that they can confide in and feel that somebody's going to do something to help make life better for them," a veteran Taylor teacher told us. Such commitment, when broadly shared by colleagues, can be a strong motivation to persist in supportive relationships with teachers when they face unappreciative students, uncooperative parents, unreasonable district demands, and searing public criticism.

In the course of our fieldwork, the leaders of two schools (St. Francis and Wilson) emerged as key actors in building and sustaining social capital among colleagues and students. St. Francis' principal, Ms. Harrison, is a dignified and soft-spoken middle-aged African-American woman who has been part of the school since its founding 30 years ago. Ms. Palmer is a warm, middle-aged white woman who has been part of the Wilson staff for two decades (15 as an English teacher, three as Paideia program coordinator, and the last two as principal). Faculty and students marvel at the commitment of these women.

referring to Palmer, a Wilson teacher exclaimed: "She could do, you know, 50 things at the same time!" Another told us, "...she deals with people as a person, not as a thing, and she tends to stay away from playing favorites." Ms. Harrison is involved in virtually every aspect of St. Francis and is generally seen by students, teachers, and parents as "the keeper of the dream" for the school.

We draw three conclusions. First, charismatic leadership makes an enormous difference in any school. Such people set the school's tone; when they have long tenures, they help maintain a school's moral traditions. Their moral leadership can be an important advantage in mobilizing productive actions. Second, we can't ignore the fact that women head the two schools where leadership stands out in our study. The school leadership literature is replete with studies showing that female principals are more democratic, more visible, and more concerned with instruction than their male counterparts (Lee, Smith, and Cioci 1993; Shakeshaft 1987). As social capital in schools is intimately intertwined with issues of democracy, collaboration, and instruction, it may be that female leaders are more able to lay the groundwork for building social capital. Our small and non-random sample makes this second conclusion conjectural, however. More solid are our first and third conclusions. First, strong leadership is very important. Third, schools may exhibit an organizational thurst toward building social capital. Discouraging, however, is the fact that such macro-level organizational thrusts are rather uncommon. Most of the impetus for social capital comes from individuals who are so inclined.

Norms, sanctions, and socialization. The formation of social capital requires the delegation of authority and effective norms or sanctions (Coleman 1990). When norms and sanctions promote civility and a group life that values cooperation and collaboration, associative ties usually lead to productive actions (Putnam 1995; 1996). Two features of high schools are relevant here: (1) how they exercise discipline and social control, and (2) how they socialize students into specific values and normative obligations. Socialization processes are more important in schools where internal norms that govern exchanges differ dramatically from the norms that students experience elsewhere in their lives. In schools of choice, where membership is by "permission," the means for social control are readily available. The ultimate sanction is to revoke a student's membership rights. Though such actions are infrequent, they represent real possibilities in the the three schools that we studied.

Although maintaining a disciplined environment was very important to

teachers at St. Francis and McGuire, strict discipline is not a prerequisite for social capital in all schools. A Jackson teacher drew an interesting distinction in the types of structures within which relationships between teachers and students exist at his school, one which he felt is associated with Jackson's small size, democratic governance, and atmosphere of tolerance. He distinguished between "structural authority," which comes simply from status differences between teachers and students (which he felt was common in large schools where teachers typically did not know their students well) and:

> ...moral authority which you have to establish yourself, and you have to be this significant adult... you can then have a much closer relationship with the kids because you don't have this sort of external authority getting in the way. (Male teacher, Jackson High School)

Jackson's behavioral norms are looser than those at St. Francis and McGuire; enforcement is also more relaxed. Yet Jackson staff maintain important behavioral norms through their personal relationships with students and through students' fear of being sent back to a comprehensive high school. At inner-city Wilson and Taylor, the looseness of Jackson High School's norms for behavior would represent a significant threat to discipline and governance. Two teachers at these schools described how they socialize students:

> Its my daily speaking with students that, you know, you leave the street outside, and when you come into school you don't behave that way. They're always looking over their shoulder, or they have their back up, or they're looking for the worst. (Male teacher, Taylor focus group)

A teacher at the other inner-city school expressed a similar concern:

> Because a lot of them in the community where they come from, the way they treat each other, we want to avoid that. We want them to understand that, "No, we can deal with things differently." And that's one of the big things I do in my class. You can disagree with somebody but that doesn't mean that you have to be ready to jump at each other. (Male teacher, Wilson focus group)

The need to socialize students into the types of behaviors and attitudes that are necessary for school success has motivated a range of "initiation programs" at Wilson and Taylor. Wilson's school-wide seminars and an instructional program that requires student discussion and debate introduce norms of interaction consistent with civility and respect. Taylor's 9th-graders attend a separate academy, where team teaching and activities that actively engage them support their transition to upper-grade academies.

Enforcing norms and sanctions, however, may also undermine the production of social capital. For example, new district policies requires all city high

schools to implement new retention/promotion standards at both Wilson and Taylor. Wilson's 9th graders are required to complete (i.e., take and pass) a minimum of 4.5 units before entering the 10th grade. They must also score at least at the 8th-grade level on proficiency tests in reading and math and have no more than 20 days of unexcused absences. The imposition of rigor from outside may seem like a good policy to a public that hears only bad news about this city's schools. However, the policy is also internally disruptive. Roughly 100 students had to repeat the 9th grade during the year of our fieldwork. Such students -- disgruntled, low-performing, and already with marginal commitment -- create problems for the instructional programs at any school.

Discussion

Social Capital Comes in Many Forms

Studying social capital in schools is not new; its intellectual roots were firmly established almost seven decades ago by Willard Waller (1932). Studies of the human dimensions of schooling, of schools as communities, of children's and families' social networks, or of social support for learning -- these topics (and many others) fall under the umbrella we currently label "social capital." One purpose of this paper is to expand the conversation within which these discussions occur, particularly by directing our inquiry to studying a few locations more deeply. We recommend that researchers who are interested in studying social capital increase both the size and magnitude of the lens they use for this type of inquiry.

It is not surprising that we found many examples of the social capital elements we describe in this paper, given that we used fieldwork in six schools to develop the elements. We surely do not suggest that the elements we have described here are the only dimensions on which school-based capital may be defined. We also recognize that our discussion of these elements is incomplete. Nevertheless, we encourage researchers interested in studying human interactions inside schools, particularly those who seek to identify a link between such human interactions and students' academic development, to sharpen the framework in which these topics are located. We hope our work provides some direction to this work.

Each element we describe clearly deserves more careful scrutiny than we have given it here. The extensive data we collected in these six school allow a much richer treatment of each element than can be presented in an article in

an academic journal. Rather than depth, we aimed to lay groundwork for deeper study of these elements in subsequent work by members of our research team and other scholars. To us, it was important to begin by "defining the turf." Hopefully, this attempt to clarify a multi-dimensional construct like social capital and to provide some examples of how the separate dimensions play out in a few schools is useful to others; it surely has been very useful to us.

There Can Be Too Much Social Capital

In many of the schools we studied social capital was in short supply. Individual teachers aimed to provide social support for learning for some students, for a host of motivations. In most schools, developing and sustaining social capital was largely an individual concern -- a micro-level construct. Particular characteristics of schools we studied (e.g., self-selected clienteles, ideologies focused on issues of the common good, small numbers of students, well developed curricula, committed faculty, organizational structures) are foundational elements for sustaining human relations directed toward students' development.

It should not be surprising that there can be too much of any good thing. However, typical treatments of social capital emphasize only positive consequences (Portes [1998] provides an exception). In one school we studied, a small high school in a rural and isolated community, naturally occurring social capital is so plentiful that school members are virtually drowning in it. There was, in fact, little intentional effort on the school's part to create meaningful social relations among adults and children. The teacher who told us that his "message" about the importance of reading fell on deaf ears because his students had heard it so often sounded almost like the parent of a teenager: "I keep telling him to pick up his room, but now he just ignores me!" A lesson we draw from this school is that relationships between teachers and students need some social distance to remain respectful. As the Coolidge students we saw were generally polite and well-behaved, the type of socialization that needed in our urban public schools was simply unnecessary. That students seemed not to trust their teachers surprised us, however.

Very little contemporary research is directed to small rural schools like this. They are hard to get to, they don't seem to have innovative programs, and they don't enroll large proportions of U.S. students. Nonetheless, many current reforms seek to create conditions that occur naturally in such settings: small instructional units, students who stay together for several

years, teachers who know students and their families intimately. We argue for the value of studying schools like Coolidge. Many features of children's lives that flow from growing up in these places -- limited knowledge of (and apprehension about) racial, ethnic, and economic diversity; parents' interest in imposing their own standards in almost every aspect of the school; hesitancy to leave or to associate with people unlike themselves; modest expectations for educational and professional accomplishment -- represent potentially serious limitations on children's futures. Ironically, some of these restrictions result from the social capital that researchers and policy makers think is so desirable.

The Coolidge school administration recognizes some of these limitations and are engaged in a major effort to overcome them through a well-developed technology program. Obviously, Coolidge students and families do see the rest of the U.S., at least as filtered through television and other media forms. Nevertheless, students' aims for higher education are modest (so different from what one would find in suburban settings) and they are fearful of leaving the community. Teachers' seeming desire to keep separate from their students, and students' general distrust of their teachers, are likely to reflect an overabundance of social capital in this type of setting.

Social Capital Can Be Difficult to Create

Just as the Coolidge village and its school are examples of naturally occurring social capital, the two urban public schools we studied demonstrate the problems confronted by schools that need (and want, in the case of these schools) to provide more support for students' development. In both schools, no more than half the students who begin the 9th grade eventually graduate. Students' weak ties to school are shown by high absenteeism. As a result, many students fail courses, get low grades, score poorly on standardized tests, and fail to progress to the next grade. Few parents attend school events, and teachers' connections to families are tenuous. In the cities where these schools operate, interventions or sanctions from the district are a constant threat.

We were struck, nonetheless, by the dedication of many teachers in these two schools to making a major difference in their students' life chances. As we selected both schools because they were engaged in important undertakings, we were not surprised to encounter many teachers involved with their work and committed to improving the lives of their students. It is clear, however, that more personalized human relations -- although important -- won't solve the

serious difficulties encountered in schools like this. Teachers confronted with student apathy or active resistance, spotty class attendance, an impoverished resource base, and threats from "downtown" have a rough row to hoe. Wilson and Taylor High Schools are, we think, on the right track. Though the structures these schools have developed that nurture positive relationships with their students are impressive, we know (as they know) they are "necessary but not sufficient."

Ideological Basis for Building Social Capital

We selected the schools in this study because they exhibit charactistics that made social capital likely. All six are "good" schools in ways that relate to our topic. Most are schools organized around a special mission of some sort. The two Catholic schools enroll many non-Catholics and many minority students; both operate on solid religious principles that support social justice, school community, and the development of students' character as well as their intellect. One inner-city public school has operated on the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools and the Paideia curriculum for over a decade. The small public school of choice has a strong democratic and alternative philosophy that attracts increasing numbers of families and students. Another inner-city high school has attracted statewide and national attention for its reorganization into schools-within-schools.

The importance of "mission" in developing and sustaining social capital is hard to assess at this point. We admit that when you select schools because they have a mission, the validity of claims of the importance of mission is suspect. Nevertheless, the ideologies underlying these schools' operation and clients' reasons for coming to them (for the choice schools) seem important factors facilitating schools' ability to help their students develop. We do not suggest a specific ideology. Nevertheless, all the ideologies we saw have value, in that they support basic the democratic principles on which the nation rests and they all recognize the value of students as individuals.

How to Learn About Social Capital in Schools

The construct of social capital is now well established in academic circles (especially in sociology, political science, education, and perhaps in development psychology). There are now several published studies (mostly quantitative) that provide empirical support that social capital (usually defined rather narrowly) is statistically (if modestly) associated with

positive student outcomes. These studies provide very little information, however, about the process by which relationships, social support, or social networks work to help young people become successful adults. Thus, we recommend that our colleagues interested in this topic take the plunge and look critically at how the notion of social capital manifests itself in schools. Deep study in a small number of sites is required to develop the construct of social capital into a meaningful theory of educational phenomena.

Technical Notes

1. There are several ways of describing features of schools that are either external to individuals or are properties of collectives of individuals because they are widely shared. The word "ethos" is sometimes used; others have called this "context," "school climate," or even "normative climate." We refer to features of school social organization. The diversity in terminology likely reflects an imprecision in definition.

2. Reconstitution in Taylor's city is seen as a serious action, as it is instituted primarily by the state in extreme situations. When schools are reconsitituted, districts impose new leadership, which typically has a mandate to change whole faculties. Designation as eligible for reconstitution brings additional resources to a school, along with substantial political embarassment to district officials.

3. During the year in which our research was conducted, high-school parents were influential in hiring one teacher (an agricultural specialist), another teacher being fired (poor classroom management), and another teacher was made to "change her ways." Parents also instituted a long-running program of bringing foreign exchange students to Coolidge. Parents have an active telephone network, and they sometimes approach school board members directly if they sense a weak school response to their suggestions. An offical policy of non-involvement for parents, which the superintendant described, may be a reaction to what school staff see as meddling.

4. Religicus orders used to "conduct" schools, which entailed substantial support in terms of staffing and finances. Starting in the late 1960s, religious order membership declined sharply, their purposes expanded well beyond schools, and Catholic school enrollments also declined. Now, religious orders "sponsor" some Catholic schools. This means that few faculty are now members of religious orders and that the schools are expected to be mostly self-supporting (through tuition). Chapter 1 of Bryk et al. (1993) provides more detail on this phenomenon.

5. Block scheduling is a "hot" high-school reform. Already in place in Jackson, Taylor, and Wilson, our other schools talked about adopting it in the near or distant future. Coolidge and St. Francis are planning it for the following year. Teachers have varying opinions about this, and some felt they are being neither consulted nor trained for this new innovation. When it began in Jackson on an experimental basis a year ago, it created much conflict. In many schools, teachers don't know how to make good use of the longer instructional periods and less frequent contact with students.

References

Adler, M. (1982). The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

Alexander, J. C. (1988). Action and its Environments, Toward a New Synthesis. New York: Columbia University Press.

Annenberg Institute for School Reform (1994). Strategy For a Challenge to the Nation for the Reform of America's Public Schools. Providence, RI: Brown University. Author.

Boisjoly, J., G.J. Duncan, and S. Hofferth (1995). Access to social capital. Journal of Family Issues, 16:619-631.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Ssociology of Education (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Bryk, A. S., V.E. Lee, and P.B. Holland (1993). Catholic Schools and the Common Good. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cochran, M., M. Larner, D. Riley, L. Gunnarrson, and C.R.Henderson, Jr. (1990). Extending Families: The Social Networks of Parents and Their Children. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital [Special issue]. American Journal of Sociology, 94:S95-S120.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1993). The rational reconstruction of society. American Sociological Review, 58:1-15.

Coleman, J. S., and T. Hoffer (1987). Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communities. New York: Basic Books.

Durkheim, E. (1973). Moral Education. New York: The Free Press.

Epstein, J. L. (1996). Federal education legislation: Implications for school, family, and community connections. In K. M. Borman, P. W. Cookson, Jr., A. R. Sadovnik, and J. Z. Spade (Eds.), Implementing Educational Reform: Sociological Perspectives on Educational Policy (pp. 215-244). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.E. Whitrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd ed. (pp. 92-118). New York: Macmillan.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., and M.E. Hughes (1995). Social capital and successful development among at-risk youth. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57:580-592.

Gamoran, A. (1996). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive, and private city high schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18:1-18.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology, 78:1360-1380.

Lee, V. E., A.S. Bryk, and J.B. Smith (1993). The organization of effective secondary schools. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, 19:171-268. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Lee, V.E., D.D. Ready, and K.E. Ross (1999 April). Personalism and Academic Press: Complications of Sustaining Social Capital in Six High Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Lee, V.E. and J.B. Smith (in press). Social support and achievement for young adolescents in Chicago: The role of school academic press. American Educational Research Journal.

Lee, V. E., J.B. Smith, and M. Cioci (1993). Teachers and principals: gender-related perceptions of leadership and power in secondary schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15: 153-180.

Lichter, D. T., G.T. Cornwell, and D.J. Eggebeen (1993). Harvesting human capital: Family structure and education among rural youth. Rural Sociology, 58:53-75.

Loury, G. (1977). A dynamic theory of racial income differences. In P. Wallace and A LeMond (Eds.), Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination (pp. 153-186). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

McDonald, J.P. (1996). Redesigning School: Lessons for the 21st Century. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, S. L., and A.B. Sorensen (1997 August). Parents' Friends and Friends' Parents: Network Components of Social Closure and Their Effects on Learning. Paper presentedd at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Miles, M.B. and A.M. Huberman (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Association of Secondary School Principals [NASSP]. [1996]. Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution. Reston, VA: Author.

Natriello, G., Riehl, C. J., and Pallas, A. M. (1994 April). Between the Rock of Standards and the Hard Place of Accommodation: Evaluation Practices of Teachers in High Schools Serving Disadvantaged Students (Report No. 47). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods, 2nd Ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Popper, Karl. (1968). The Logic of Scientific Discovery, 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Row.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. Annual Review of Sociology, 24:1-24.

Putnam, R. D. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. The American Prospect, 24:34-48.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. Journal of Democracy, 6:65-77.

Schneider, B. (1996). School, parent, and community involvement: The federal government invests in social capital. In K. M. Borman, P. W. Cookson, Jr., A. R. Sadovnik, and J. Z. Spade (Eds.), Implementing Educational Reform: Sociological Perspectives on Educational Policy (pp. 193-214). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in Educational Administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Simmel, G. (1978). The Philosophy of Money. London: Routledge.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's Compromise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, M. H., L.J. Beaulieu, and G.D. Israel (1992). Effects of human capital and social capital on dropping out of high school in the south. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 8:75-87.

Stake, R.E. (1994). Case studies. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research (pp.236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanton-Salazar, R.D. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children and youth. Harvard Educational Review, 67:1-40.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. and S.M. Dornbusch (1995). Social capital and the reproduction of inequality: Information networks among Mexican-origin high school students. Sociology of Education, 68:116-135.

Waller, W. (1932). Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley.

Weber, M. (1968). Economy and Society (Edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yin, R.K. (1994). Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Table 1: Conceptual Framework for Investigating School-Based Social Capital

Element	Central Questions	Important Implications
Qualities Uses of Social Capital	What are the fundamental uses of social capital in a school? What are individuals trying to accomplish?	Uses of social capital may support academic, social, or other goals. Uses may conflict or promote a school's purported mission.
Location of Social Capital	What are the social networks central to a schools daily life? Do these networks involve students and teacher interacting cooperatively toward shared goals?	The quality of student-teacher relationships is fundamental to a school's academic mission and students' development.
Intentionality of Social Capital	Do adults actively encourage the creation of positive relationships with students and other adults at a school?	Social capital occurs 'naturally' in small homogeneous communities, but it may also occur 'intentionally' in large heterogeneous communities.
Mechanisms Volition & Choices	Are students, teachers, and parents given an opportunity to affiliate with others based on their perceived interests?	Volition may involve external choices, as when teachers and families choose schools, or internal choices, as when students and teachers select programs.
Impetus for Social Capital	Are personal values and interests supportive of cooperative actions? Do organizational traditions, ideologies, and leadership create an impetus for social capital?	The urge to foster social capital may arise from personal or organizational factors. Social capital is strongest when organizational factors reinforce personal values and interests.
Norms, Sanctions, and Socialization	What are the behavioral expectations for students, teachers, and other adults? Are their specific actions taken to promote positive and discourage negative behaviors?	Norms of civility lay a foundation for social capital in school. When absent considerable effort may be required to create and enforce norms conducive to a school's mission.